



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE COLLEGE ELEMENT IN HAMLET

The allusions to Shakespeare in the two Cambridge plays, the *Return from Parnassus* and the *Return from Parnassus or the Scourge of Simony*—plays which we shall designate as *P1* and *P2*—should be familiar to students of the Elizabethan drama, yet as the argument of this paper is based chiefly upon them, a brief review of these references to the dramatist is necessary.

In December, 1598, the scholars of St. John's College, Cambridge, produced the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, a purely academic piece, with allusions to the curriculum, with quotations and adaptations from the Latin poets, and, strikingly like our modern undergraduate productions, with hits on town celebrities, among whom we find Hobson, of Miltonic fame. That the *Pilgrimage* was favorably received, obtaining more than the ordinary success, is proved by the fact that it was followed by *P1* and *P2*. *P1* was produced during the holiday season of 1600–1 and *P2* the following year, some time between Christmas, 1601, and January 5, 1602.¹ In *P1* a principal character is the fool, Gullio, who

¹ Scholars are not agreed as to the date of the production of *P2*. Arber dates it "rather in the first days of January, 1602, than in the last six of December, 1601, probably on New Year's day, 1602, as we now reckon." See the introduction to Arber's reprint of *P2* (London, 1878); also Smeaton's edition of this play, *Temple Dramatists* (London, 1905), Introduction, xii, p. 121, n. Fleay, *Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), Vol. II, p. 354, misreading the Dominical letters (see *infra*) dates the production 1603. Wilhelm Luhr, in his Kiel dissertation, *Die drei Cambridger Spiele vom Parnass* (1900), gives a detailed discussion of this question of chronology, and dates the production 1603. As this would invalidate our argument, it is necessary to show wherein he is mistaken.

In *P2*, Act III, Scene I, Immerito, examined before Sir Raderic, states that the Dominical letter for the year is C. While this answer is called correct, the page completes it by adding the letter D. Now D designated the portion of the year from March 25, through December 31, 1601; C, the period from January 1, 1602, through March 24, 1602. (All the dates here given are N. S.) Thus the complete answer was that the Dominical letters for the year, March 25, 1601, to March 24, 1602, were D C. In this same scene Immerito, when asked, "When is the new moone?" replies correctly, "The last quarter, the 5 day, at 2 of the clock, and 38 minutes in the morning." Luhr, who has made careful calculation, states that this answer fits January 5, 1602. For a last point, the nine allusions in the play to Christmas and the New Year season, further establish the time of production. There can be no doubt that Luhr is correct in stating that *P2* "ursprünglich für das Weihnachtsfest 1601-1602 bestimmt war."

P2 has practically two prologues, the first in prose, followed by 88 lines in couplets. In the prose prologue Momus says, "What is presented here, is an old musty show, that hath lain this twelvemonth in the bottom of a coal-house amongst brooms and old shoes, an invention that we are ashamed of, and therefore we have promised the copies to the chandlers to wrap his candles in" (Smeaton's ed., p. 4). From this statement Luhr evolves the

desires to pose as a man of parts, and has accordingly memorized from *Venus and Adonis* and *Romeo and Juliet* several lines which he recites with great gusto, declaring that he admires them so much that he will have "sweet Mr. Shakespeare's" picture in his study.¹ Ingenioso, the wit of the play, approves the poetry, but laughs at the gull who tries to appropriate the poet's verses. At Gullio's request Ingenioso composes some stanzas in the style of Chaucer ("Chaucer's vaine" is seen chiefly in the use of such forms as *yheried* or *slepen*), parodies the opening lines of the *Fairy Queen*, and imitates *Venus and Adonis*. This alone pleases Gullio. A few lines of the play should be quoted here.

Gullio. Let mee heare Mr. Shakspear's veyne.

Ingenioso. Faire Venus, queene of beutie and of love,
Thy red doth stayne the blushing of the morne
Thy snowie necke shameth the milkwhite dove,
Thy presence doth this naked worlde adorne:
Gazing on thee all other nymphes I scorne.
When ere thou dyest slowe shine that Satterday,
Beutie and grace muste sleepe with thee for aye!

following theory: "Der zweite Teil der *Return from Parnassus* ohne Prosaprológ wurde vielleicht im Dezember 1601 für eine Aufführung am 1 Januar 1602 geschrieben. Umstände unbekannter Art verhinderten die Aufführung. Nach einem Jahr holte man das Lustspiel wieder hervor und fügte als Erklärung für Anspielungen auf ältere Ereignisse und zugleich als Entschuldigung für das Unterlassen einer Neubearbeitung den Prosaprológ hinzu. In dieser Form wurde die *Scourge of Simony* im Januar 1603 . . . aufgeführt" (pp. 19, 20).

There are two good arguments against this assumption: (1) To interpret this jesting prologue, with its depreciation of the play, as anything but a humorous statement is to lose the whole spirit of the piece. (2) The author of the *Parnassus* plays shows unmistakably by his allusions to contemporary events a desire to bring his dramas "up to date." If, as Luhr contends, *P2* was produced 1602-3, why did not the writer change the Dominical letters to correspond with that year, and thus give some point to Immerito's examination? Luhr answers this by asserting that instead of making the trifling changes in the text, the writer added a prose prologue to explain why his dates were not correct. Surely this is wide of the mark, for a man with wit enough to write *P2* would have sense enough to revise it.

Luhr, following Ward (*A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* [London, 1899], Vol. II, p. 633, n.), has yet another argument. In the Halliwell-Phillips MS of *P2*, Momus says, in the prose prologue, "Is it not a pretty humour to stand hammering upon two schollers some foure yeare." These "two schollers" made their first appearance in the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, produced during the Christmas season 1598-99. Adding four years to this date, the production of *P2* would seem to fall in 1602-3. But there is another way of interpreting the phrase "some foure yeare." The *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* was acted, as we have said, 1598-99, and it is not impossible that it was repeated in the holidays of 1599-1600. In any case, *P1* was acted during the holidays of 1600-1, and if, as internal evidence shows, *P2* was acted during the Christmas season, 1601-2, it would be the fourth holiday performance since the appearance of the two scholars. We therefore date the production of *P2* some time between December 25, 1601, and January 5, 1602. Cf. F. E. Schelling's *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston, 1908), Vol. II, p. 489.

¹ Act III, scene 1. See *Parnassus, Three Elizabethan Comedies*, edited by W. D. Macray (Clarendon Press, 1886).

Gullio. Noe more! I am one that can judge accordinge to the proverbe, *bovem ex unguibus*. Ey marry, sir, these have some life in them! Let this duncified worlde esteeme of Spencer and Chaucer, I'le worshipp sweet Mr. Shakspeare, and to honour him will lay his *Venus and Adonis* under my pillowe, as wee reade of one (I doe not well remember his name, but I am sure he was a kinge) slept with Homer under his bed's heade.¹

In *P2*, Ingenioso and Judicio "censure" the list of poets from whose writing John Bodenham drew the selections for his *Belvedere or the Garden of the Muses*, 1600, and come to the names of Ben Jonson and Shakespeare:

Ingenioso. Ben Jonson

Judicio. The wittiest fellow of a bricklayer in England.

Ingenioso. A mere empiric, one who gets what he hath by observation, and makes only nature privy to what he endites; so slow an inventor, that he were better betake himself to his old trade of bricklaying, a bold whoreson, as confident now in making of a book, as he was in times past in laying of a brick.

William Shakespeare

Judicio. Who loves Adonis love, or Lucrece' rape,
His sweeter verse contains heart-robbing life,
Could but a graver subject him content,
Without love's foolish lazy languishment.²

While the contrast to Jonson is such a marked one that the allusion to Shakespeare is unmistakable praise, it is rather disappointing to find *Venus and Adonis* alone mentioned; however, in Act IV, scene 3, when Burbage and Kemp are brought on the stage, the plays are lauded. The passage is as follows:

Burbage. Now, Will Kemp, if we can entertain these scholars at a low rate, it will be well, they have oftentimes a good conceit in a part.

Kemp. It's true indeed, honest Dick, but the slaves are somewhat proud, and besides, it is a good sport in a part to see them never speak in their walk, but at the end of the stage, just as though in walking with a fellow we should never speak but at a stile, a gate, or a ditch, where a man can go no further. I was once at a comedy in Cambridge, and there I saw a parasite make faces and mouths of all sorts of this fashion.

Burbage. A little teaching will mend these faults, and it may be besides they will be able to pen a part.

Kemp. Few of the University pen plays well, they smell too much of that writer Ovid, and that writer Metamorphosis, and talk too much of

¹ Act IV, scene 1.

² See Smeaton's ed., Act I, scene 2.

Proserpina and Juppiter. Why, here's our fellow Shakespeare puts them all down—ay, and Ben Jonson too. O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow; he brought up Horace giving the poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him bewray his credit.

Burbage. It's a shrewd fellow indeed.

A few lines farther on, Burbage tells Philomusus, a student candidate for the stage, to act a little of *Richard III*, and immediately, as though reciting a *locus classicus*, Philomusus begins:

Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by the sun of York.

The natural interpretation of these allusions to Shakespeare is that his poems and plays were in everyone's mouth, and that at Cambridge, at least, he was not only ranked far above Ben Jonson, but prized beyond every one of the contemporary dramatists. On the other hand, Mr. Macray, who discovered the MSS of the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and *P1*, and first printed these plays, believes that these references show indeed Shakespeare's popularity, "but it is popularity only with a certain class." "The notices in the third play (i. e., *P2*) seem (as Mr. Mullinger has remarked, in *University of Cambridge*, p. 524, note) "to convey the notion that Shakespeare is the favorite of the rude half-educated strolling players, as distinguished from the refined geniuses of the University. . . . Certainly the popularity assigned to him is not of a sort to be desired, but the popularity itself is indisputable."¹ Such a conclusion is surely wide of the mark. In the fifth chapter of the tenth book of *Amelia*, Fielding introduces Colonel Bath praising Shakespeare.

That Shakespeare[cries the Colonel] was a fine fellow. He was a very pretty poet indeed. Was it not Shakespeare that wrote the play about Hotspur? You must remember these lines. I got them almost by heart at the play house; for I never missed the play whenever it was acted, if I was in town:

By Heav'n it was an easy leap,
To pluck bright honour into the full moon,
Or drive into the bottomless deep.

¹ Macray's *Parnassus*, Preface, x. Sarrazin, *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis* (Berlin, 1892), p. 88, finds in *P2*, Act V, scene 1, ll. 2-18, "eine deutliche Spitze gegen Shakespeare," but the reference is a general one directed against actors as a class. Cf. Sidney Lee, *Life of Shakespeare*, chap. xii; also *Athenaeum*, London, November 13, 1886.

And—and—faith, I have almost forgot them; but I know it is something about saving your honour from drowning—O! it is very fine! I say, damn me, the man that writ these lines was the greatest poet the world ever produced. There is dignity of expression and emphasis of thinking, damn me.

It is well known that Fielding yielded to no man in his admiration of Shakespeare, and in this passage he ridicules not the very pretty poet, but the honor-loving Colonel himself. So in these college plays, the folly of Gullio is rendered but more apparent by his attempt to appreciate what is so far above his weak brain; or, to look at the matter from another point of view, even a brainless fop grasps the fact that Shakespeare is the pre-eminent writer of the day, and that he must profess the keenest admiration for the works of the dramatist if he desires to appear to be a man of intellect. Furthermore, in *P2* Burbage and Kemp are not represented as "rude, half-educated strolling players," and their praise of Shakespeare is to be taken as seriously as their strictures on the awkward stage presence of undergraduate actors. Clearly then, the Cambridge plays commend Shakespeare in a manner which seems half-hearted when compared with our modern estimates of his genius, yet in a manner quite extraordinary when we remember how rarely on the Elizabethan stage is a tribute paid to the work of a contemporary dramatist.¹

That the high estimate placed on his writings by the scholars of St. John's was unknown to Shakespeare is incredible, and it is interesting to note, in this connection, that Shakespeare's friend and patron, Henry Wriothesley, third earl of Southampton, had been a student at St. John's (1585-89) and that he maintained throughout his life a deep interest in the college, sending his son there to be educated, and bestowing on the library a valuable collection of books and manuscripts. At the time of the production of *P2* he was in prison, implicated in the attempted insurrection of the Earl of Essex, yet Shakespeare must have heard of the dramatic activity at the *alma mater* of his great benefactor.² That

¹ Cf. Shakespeare's brief reference to Marlowe:

Dead shepherd, now I feel thy saw of might,
"Who ever loved that loved not at first sight."

—*A. Y. L. L.*, III, v, 82.

² See Lee's *Shakespeare*, Appendices III, IV.

a dramatist who spoke of himself regretfully as an "unlettered clerk" would be unmoved by the acclaim of the university wits is beyond question. Some four years after Ben Jonson had been so roughly handled in *P2*, he produced successfully at Oxford and Cambridge his *Volpone*, and so delighted was he with the favor the colleges had shown this comedy that he dedicated it "to the most noble and equal sisters, the two famous Universities, for their love and acceptance shown to this poem in the presentation." Speaking of himself as "the grateful acknowledger" and declaring that he is "studious to justify" their bounty, throughout all the dedication—the longest he ever wrote—he shows unmistakably his pride in the applause of his academic audiences and his eager desire to retain their approval. It cannot be presumed that Shakespeare was less sensitive to the approbation of the scholarly world. Whatever opinion we hold of the autobiographic value of the sonnets, one fact is evident—that Shakespeare was touched to the heart by friendship and by appreciation of his work, and that he repaid the recognition of his own worth and of the value of his writings with a splendid gratitude as sincere in its feeling as it is exquisite in its expression. Would it not be remarkable if Shakespeare counted as little worth the praise of Cambridge, and more unnatural still if he made no grateful reference to it?

P2 was produced, as we have stated, between Christmas day, 1601, and January 5, 1602. On July 26, 1602, there was entered on the *Stationers' Register* "A booke called the *Revenge of Hamlett Prince (of) Denmark* as yt was lateli Acted by the Lord Chamberleyne his servants," and in 1603 appeared *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* by William Shakespeare. "As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse servants in the cittie of London: as also in the two Universities of Cambridge and Oxford and elsewhere." This, *Q1*, is undoubtedly the book mentioned the previous year in the *Register*, for in 1603 the Lord Chamberlain's Servants became the King's Players, and thus the change in the name of the troupe can be explained. The important fact, however, in considering the title of *Q1* is that this play, Shakespeare's first revision of the *Ur-Hamlet* (which we shall designate as *Z*) was acted at the Universities, and that it was a

success there is understood by such an announcement.¹ I have been unable to obtain information concerning all the known Shakespeare quartos, but an examination of photographic reproductions of thirty, including all the first quartos, shows that *Hamlet* is the only play advertised as having been performed at Cambridge.² This is significant. It now remains to fix as nearly as possible the date of its performance at Cambridge. It is a fair assumption that it did not precede the production of *P2*, for a play so popular as *Hamlet* proved to be would have naturally impressed Shakespeare's admirers to such an extent that they would have made some reference to it, however slight, giving it at least as much mention as *Hieronimo* or *Richard III* received at their hands. Moreover, the play must have been acted very shortly before July 26, 1602. Clark and Wright have stated this point most clearly:

We are inclined to think that it was acted not long before 26 July, 1602. One reason for this opinion is, that if the play had been long a popular one and had been frequently represented, the printer or publisher would have had many opportunities of procuring a more accurate copy than that from which the edition of 1603 was made. The errors of this edition, and the manifest haste with which it was printed seem to show that the play had only been acted a short time before, and that the publisher went to press with the first copy he could obtain, however imperfect. This supposition is favoured by the expression in the *Stationer's Register* "as it was lately acted," which would hardly have been used of a play which had long been popular.³

In other words, a few months after *P2* is performed at Cambridge, *Hamlet* is acted there. It is but natural, we repeat, to seek in *Q1* some acknowledgment on Shakespeare's part of the praise Cambridge had bestowed on him, or, at the very least, some friendly tribute to the student body; and this, indeed, is not wanting. It is to be found, first, in the college atmosphere which Shakespeare adds to the *Hamlet* story, and, secondly, in the type of college student which Shakespeare depicts. These two points deserve to be treated at some length.

¹The word "revision" implies the addition of so much new material that Shakespeare may properly be called the creator of *Hamlet*.

²"*Hamlet* was the only drama by Shakespeare that was acted in his lifetime at the two Universities," Lee, *Shakespeare*, chap. xiii.

³*Hamlet*, Clarendon Press, 1880, Preface, ix.

In the chronicle of Saxo Grammaticus there is naturally no mention of the University of Wittenberg, and Belleforest, who followed Saxo closely, has no reference to Hamlet's student days. As for Horatio, he is dimly discerned in a short reference to a nameless friend of Hamlet who warns and aids him.¹ It is in *Q1* and in the German *Hamlet*, *Der Bestrafte Brudermord oder Prinz Hamlet aus Dannemark* (which we shall designate as *D*), that we find the first reference to Wittenberg; moreover, in *Q1* Horatio is a student there, while in *D* he is a soldier at the court. This brings us face to face with the great problem in the study of the text of *Hamlet*. It is generally agreed that *Z*, which Shakespeare partially revised in *Q1* and which he further revised and enlarged in *Q2* (1604) was written by Kyd. Does *D* represent, in distorted form, this play by Kyd or is it a very faulty adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*? On this point scholars have been and are still divided.² Although the arguments against the theory that *D* derives from *Z* have been stated at greater length than the arguments for it, I believe that *D*, both because of its specific resemblances to Kyd's works and because of its general likeness, in language, character, and plot, to the pre-Shakespearean drama, certainly represents *Z*, though in a sadly mangled form, and this theory, moreover, adapts itself perfectly to the contention of this

¹See Robert Gericke, *Hamlet-Quellen* (Leipzig, 1881), pp. l-iii.

²For the theory that *D* is derived from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* see the articles by W. Creizenach in *Berichte der philol.-histor. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, p. 1 (Leipzig, 1887); *Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten, deutsche National-literatur* (Berlin u. Stuttgart), Vol. XXIII, 1889; "'Der bestrafte Brudermord' and Its Relation to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 249 (Chicago, 1904); Gustav Tanger, "'Der bestrafte Brudermord' u. sein Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXIII, p. 224, 1888; cf. also E. Herz, "Englische Schauspieler u. englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeares in Deutschland," in Litzmann's *Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen*, Vol. XVIII, p. 87 (Hamburg u. Leipzig, 1903); Edward Dowden, *Hamlet*, Introduction, p. xiv (London, 1899); F. S. Boas, *Thomas Kyd*, Introduction, p. xlviii (London, 1901); A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 406, note (London, 1904). For the theory that *D* is derived from *Z* see R. G. Latham, *Two Dissertations on the Hamlet of Saxo Grammaticus and of Shakespeare* (London, 1872); W. H. Wither, *Harness Prize Essay* (London, 1880); H. H. Furness, *Hamlet*, Vol. II, p. 120 (Philadelphia, 1877); John Corbin, "The German *Hamlet* and the Earlier English Versions," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Vol. V (Boston, 1896); A. H. Thorndike, "*Hamlet* and Contemporary Revenge Plays" in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XVII, No. 2 (Baltimore, 1902); J. Schick, "Die Entstehung des *Hamlet*" in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXVIII, 1902; M. B. Evans, "*Der Bestrafte Brudermord*," *sein Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's Hamlet* (Hamburg u. Leipzig, 1902); "'Der Bestrafte Brudermord' and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, 1905; C. M. Lewis, *The Genesis of Hamlet* (New York, 1907).

paper. To treat this matter in detail would be to lose the thread of our argument without reason, for the authorities cited in the note offer a most thorough discussion of the whole question.

As has been stated, in *Q1* Horatio is a student; in *D* he is a soldier.¹ In spite of the fact that *D* has received at the hands of its adaptors and revisers "many alterations and dilutions," and that the text cannot be traced earlier than 1710,² that natural desire to give the play a German setting, seen so plainly in this late text, may be attributed also to the earliest adaptor, to the earliest text. That Hamlet, in *D*, had been a student at Wittenberg can scarcely be explained by this tendency, for that university was well known in England and might well be mentioned by a London dramatist. The Faustus of Marlowe's play was a student at "Wertenberg" and Lyly in his *Euphues*, published 1579, takes "Wittenberge" to represent the German universities, as Paris represents the scholarship of France.³ On the other hand, when we find in *D* mention of Hamburg and Saxony; when we find the story, well known to Elizabethan dramatists,⁴ of a murder confessed at a play transferred from England to Strassburg; when we find a legend of "a cavalier in Anion" which appears also in contemporary plays,⁵ we have a right to assume that these German allusions had been added and that the actors concluded that the play needed more local coloring. This being the case, why is not Horatio a student at Wittenberg in *D* as he is in *Q1*? If the German adaptor could have one more allusion to a German town, would he wilfully forego it? Horatio is an important character and if the adaptor of *D* had seen or read *Q1* and but dimly remembered it, is it probable that he would forget that such a prominent person as the confidant of the Prince was a student? We are led to the conclusion that Horatio is a soldier in *D* because he was a soldier in *Z*, on which *D* is based.

¹ See *Fratricide Punished (D)*, Act I, scene 3. It can be consulted most conveniently in Furness' *Variorum Hamlet*, Vol. II.

² See Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1865). Cohn derives *D* from *Z*. Cf. Widgery, *Harness Prize Essay*, pp. 104-25.

³ See Arber's edition of *Euphues*, p. 140 (London, 1868).

⁴ See the play, *A Warning for Faire Women* (London, 1599), reprinted in R. Simpson's *School of Shakespeare* (London, 1878), also Thomas Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, Book III (London, 1612).

⁵ See *D*, Act II, scenes 4, 7; cf. Boas, *Kyd*, xlviii; Furness, *Hamlet*, Vol. II, p. 118.

This explains the inconsistency in the character of Horatio. In *Q 1*, as in *Q 2*, he has hardly appeared in the opening scene of the first act, when we are told that he is a scholar. "Thou art a scholler, speake to it Horatio." As the ghost disappears, Marcellus asks Horatio whether it is not like the king, to which he replies:

As thou art to thy selfe
Such was the very armor he had on,
When he the ambitious Norway combated.
So frownd he once, when in an angry parle
He smot the sleaded pollax on the yce,
Tis strange.¹

Here Horatio talks as a veteran who had witnessed the king's duel with Fortinbras, and who had followed him in at least one of his campaigns. Dowden avoids this difficulty by explaining that Horatio did not necessarily witness the duel, and that "the armour would be remembered and be pointed out, when worn later."² While this is a possible interpretation, it is certainly not the natural one. Horatio speaks as an old soldier, and when his comrades in arms wish an explanation of the ghost's appearance, it is Horatio who gives the account of the fight with Fortinbras and explains the threatened invasion. We hardly expect a student at Wittenberg to be better informed on the military history of Denmark than the members of the Danish army. Of course it is not impossible that Horatio turned from the camp to the study, that he left the army for the university, but it does not seem probable. If we conclude that Shakespeare, in changing Horatio from a soldier to a student, did not remove all the inconsistencies such a change involved, we have an explanation that accords with Shakespeare's manner of work in other plays. Moreover, it is not difficult to see why Shakespeare retained the lines that show Horatio to be a soldier. It was essential to the story that Horatio should recognize the ghost, and therefore the dramatist retained the soldier's recollections of his old commander, which makes the identification indisputable. This point established, Horatio becomes the scholar who has seen the king but once, and to whom the

¹ *Q 1*; *Q 2* follows this word for word with slight changes of spelling.

² Dowden, *Hamlet*, p. 7, note.

court is unfamiliar ground. The action in the opening pages is so rapid, the lines in the first scenes are spoken so hurriedly that the spectator, absorbed in the unfolding of an exciting plot, does not perceive the inconsistency, and is accordingly no more disturbed by it than by the perplexing "double time" in *Othello*.

This theory that Horatio in *Z*, as in *D*, was a soldier, helps to explain the vexed question of Horatio's age. Certainly the impression given by the play is that Hamlet and Horatio are equal in years. In *Q1* Hamlet's age is not given, though it is a common statement that he is nineteen.¹ In *Q2* he is plainly thirty, therefore Horatio, who must have been fairly old when he witnessed the duel between Hamlet's father and Fortinbras, is at least fifty, for that contest took place on the day Hamlet was born. Is not this an inconsistency arising from the composite character of Horatio, part scholar, part soldier?

There is yet another aspect of the case to be considered. If, as we maintain, Horatio was changed from a soldier to a student as a tribute to the universities, it certainly follows that *Q1*, the version acted at Cambridge, should have the character of Horatio clearly and fully drawn. Such, indeed, is the case. Comparing the Horatio of *Q1* with the Horatio of *Q2*, the enlarged version, we shall find but very little change. It is true that some interesting lines are added in *Q2*, and it is important to note these passages. They are as follows: Horatio's description of the portents in Rome, "a little ere the mightiest Julius fell" (Act I, scene 2), is missing in *Q1*; Horatio does not appear in *Q1* as the protector of the distraught Ophelia; in *Q1* Horatio receives letters from Hamlet telling of his escape from "Gilderstone and Rossencraft," and he discloses this to the queen, while in *Q2* Hamlet himself, after his return to Elsinore, tells Horatio of his escape; *Q1* omits some of Horatio's short comments in the graveyard scene and in the conversation with Osric, and gives the two last speeches of Horatio, at the very close of the play, in shortened form. What we most miss in *Q1* is Horatio's quiet attempt to recall the Prince from those thoughts that wander through eternity to the path of safety

¹ Bradley affirms that all that can be gathered from the text is that Hamlet was "more than twelve," *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 408. Cf. Sir Edward Sullivan, "On Hamlet's Age," *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, XXVII.

and duty: "Twere to consider too curiously to consider so." In leaving this comparison of the two quartos, it must be mentioned that Hamlet's noble speech to his friend, in which, breaking down the reserve that even the closest companions feel, he discloses his admiration for one who is not passion's slave, appears in *Q1* in a short fifteen-line version which compares most unfavorably with the perfected version in *Q2*. With all these differences noted, the surprising consideration is not that they exist, but that they are not greater, especially when we observe the great changes made in *Q2* in the parts of Claudius, Gertrude, and Laertes, to say nothing of Hamlet himself.¹ On the other hand, in several scenes in which Horatio appears (for example, in Act I) *Q1* and *Q2* are practically the same text. It is therefore a safe assertion that Horatio, as he was presented to the students of Cambridge, was an important character, drawn at length, and that in this character Shakespeare adds the college element to the drama.

There is one minor point on which we may touch before leaving this part of the discussion. In *Q1* appears the allusion to Corambis (Polonius) as an actor at the university.

Hamlet. My lord, you playd in the Universitie.

Corambis. That I did my L: and I was counted a good actor.

Hamlet. What did you enact there?

Corambis. My lord, I did act Julius Caesar, I was killed in the Capitoll, Brutus killed me.

Hamlet. It was a brute part of him, to kill so capitall a calfe.

Mr. Fleay concludes from these lines that the actor who took the part of Polonius had been cast for Caesar in Shakespeare's tragedy.² Is not this, however, merely an allusion to undergraduate plays, inserted to please a student audience?

The second point of our contention is that in Horatio Shakespeare departs from the type of student depicted in the Elizabethan drama. As a matter of fact, the university scholar is a rare figure. The soldier, the gull, the fop, the amorist, the bravo, the lord, the peasant, men of all classes and types cross and recross the stage,

¹For a very careful comparison of the texts of *Q1* and *Q2*, see Tanger's article in *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, IX, Part II. I am utterly unable to accept the conclusions drawn from this comparison.

²*Life of Shakespeare*, p. 229 (London, 1886).

but in this throng of characters there are but few students.¹ Of all the dramatists, we should expect Ben Jonson, both because of his scholarly tastes and his wide vision, to present a student character in one of his plays, but we search for him in vain. In the opening lines of *Every Man in His Humour*, Knowell, speaking of his son, says:

He is a scholar, if a man may trust
The liberal voice of fame in her report,
Of good account in both our Universities
Either of which hath favoured him with graces,

but we soon find that young Knowell has left the university behind him and he appears not as a student, but as a young man about town. In the list of characters prefixed to *Every Man out of His Humour*, we find Fungoso, "a student; one that has reveled in his time, and follows the fashions afar off, like a spy." On examining the play, we find that while Fungoso is supposed to be studying at the Inns of Court, he represents, not the student, but the fop, who vainly strives to be in the fashion.

Unlucky as Fungoso in the play,
These sparks with awkward vanity display
What the fine gentlemen wore yesterday.²

Lovell, in his *New Inn*, is described as a "scholar," and Compass, in the *Magnetic Lady*, is called a "scholar mathematick," but both of these characters have left their college days far behind them. Thus, while Jonson introduces in his plays college-bred men, he does not give us the undergraduate, and this is typical of the Elizabethan dramatists.

The undergraduate, however, does figure in the literature of the day. John Lyly, who had passed several years at Oxford, refers in his popular novel to students and student life. The following lines show the nature of his comments:

Moreover, who doth know a scholler by his habite? Is there any hat of so unseemely a fashion, anye doublet of so long a waste, any hose so

¹ A rapid reading of 9 plays by Ford, 16 by Chapman, 18 by Massinger, 19 by Dekker, 22 by Thomas Heywood, and 51 by Beaumont and Fletcher, confirms this opinion. Laureo, in Dekker's *Patient Grissil*, has been nine years at the University, and at the opening of the play, leaves college because of his poverty. He is the one college student in all these dramas. Several "poor scholars" are mentioned in them, but they are not connected with a university.

² Pope, *Essay on Criticism*, ll. 329, 330.

short, any attyre, either so costly or so courtly, either so straunge in making, or so monstrous in wearing, that it is not worn of a Scholler? Have they not now in steede of black cloth blacke velvet, in steede of course sackecloth, fine silke? Be they not more lyke courtiers than schollers, more like stage-players than students, more like ruffians of Naples than disputers in Athens? I would to god they did not imitate al other nations in ye vice of the minde, as they doe in the attyre of their body, for certeinly as there is no nation whose fashion in apparel they do not use, so there is no wickednesse publyshed in anye place, that they do not practice. . . . Is it not become a bye word amongst the common people, that they had rather sende their children to the carte than to the Universitie, being induced so to say, for the abuse that reigneth in the Universities?¹

This is hardly a favorable introduction to a consideration of student characters, and yet two dramatists give us as disagreeable a picture of the collegian as does Lyly. We shall select two plays, one written before the appearance of *Q1*, the other, after it—*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, by Greene, and *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, by Middleton.² In Greene's play we find the scene laid at Oxford, and naturally students appear. We have a graceful description of the college town:

These Oxford schools
Are richly seated near the river side:
The mountains full of fat and fallow deer,
The battling pastures lade with kine and flocks,
The town gorgeous with high built colleges,
And scholars seemly in their grave attyre,
Learned in searching principles of art.

Unfortunately the seemingly scholars, so far as the undergraduates are concerned, are not shown us, but in their stead we have the student Miles, a clown, a buffoon of the lowest order. In Middleton's comedy we have Tim Yellowhammer brought with his tutor from Cambridge to London. This young hopeful, a broadly comic character, is remarkable chiefly for his bad Latin, and for the ease with which a woman of the town, posing as a Welsh heiress, gulls him into marriage.

¹ Arber's *Euphues*, pp. 139-41; also p. 190.

² *Friar Bacon* was published in 1594; *A Chaste Maid*, in 1630. Henslowe's diary records that *Friar Bacon* was acted February 19, 1592; we have no means of fixing the date of the production of *A Chaste Maid*, but it certainly is later than the production of *Q1*.

Turning from these discreditable representatives of the student class, we find Horatio to be one of the most admirable, one of the most lovable characters in English dramatic literature.¹ He is a Dane, but Hamlet has met him, not at Elsinore, but at Wittenberg, for Horatio is not of the court set—he has seen Hamlet's father but once, he is unacquainted with Osric and Laertes, and he asks naïvely, on hearing from the battlements the sounds of the king's carousing, whether such revelry is customary at court. His poverty would bar him from the palace, for he is so poor that he "has suffered all," yet the poor man's contumely he has borne unembittered, and Hamlet, a prince out of his sphere, is drawn irresistibly to this generous, strong, yet modest student. On hearing the news of the king's death, he leaves the university to attend the funeral, and with characteristic modesty forbears even to see his friend in his great sorrow. When Hamlet meets him, and inquires with surprise why he has left the lecture halls, he answers lamely, to spare his friend's feelings, that he is playing truant—"cutting," the American student would say. The instant refusal of Hamlet to accept this statement discloses the manner of Horatio's life, and though the text does not show it, Hamlet evidently entreats his friend to remain with him and aid him. Every trait in the man is admirable. When Ophelia has no helper, it is Horatio who insists that the queen must see her. Though he cannot avert the final catastrophe, his anxiety for Hamlet is always apparent, whether on the battlements, when he restrains the prince from following the ghost, or before the fencing match, when he urges him to postpone the bout. The finer touches are not lacking in this picture, as when Horatio shows a quiet humor in his comment on Osric, or when he bluntly refuses to rate Hamlet's fencing skill as highly as the prince desired. His desperate attempt to drink the dregs of the poison, his consenting to live that he may fulfil Hamlet's last request, complete the portrait of this scholar, a portrait rarely surpassed, as the friendship of Hamlet and Horatio, expressed in so few words, is the finest conception of a

¹It is strange that so little has been written about him. The forty-two volumes of the *Jahrbuch* contain many articles on *Hamlet*, but the only references to Horatio are Vols. VI, pp. 309, 310; XIX, pp. 32, 33; XXIX, pp. 231-39. Bradley, in his illuminating study of *Hamlet*, passes by "the beautiful character of Horatio." See his *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 166.

college friendship in the English drama. And when all is done, when Horatio has told of the carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts, the accidental judgments, casual slaughters, he receives no honors, but (we must believe) he returns to the university, as quietly as he had left it, to resume the life of a poor scholar.

This analysis of the character of Horatio completes the argument, for it proves beyond question that Shakespeare, when he drew him, ennobled student character. That Shakespeare was led to do this because his works had been commended in the *Parnassus* plays, and by the additional reason that Hamlet was acted at Cambridge, is a theory we have endeavored to justify. Absolute proof in such a matter can never be obtained but we have brought forward several facts that support such a theory. If Shakespearean scholars decide that it is merely an interesting conjecture, even then it may be deemed worthy of consideration, for it serves to place in a new light a noble nature in the profoundest of English tragedies.

EDWARD BLISS REED

YALE COLLEGE